

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 2 - 2007

**DEANNA J. SHIRLEY**  
**Registered Patent Attorney**  
3418 Baldwin Way, Santa Rosa, CA 95403  
707.953.9887 (mobile & voice mail)  
deanna\_shirley@sbcglobal.net


**FACSIMILE COVERSHEET**

**To:** Examiner Christopher Koharski      **From:** Deanna J. Shirley  
**Co:** USPTO Art Unit 3763      **Phone:** (707) 953-9887  
**Fax:** (571) 273-8300      **Fax:** (707) 571-8700  
**Phone:** (703) 272-7230      **Date:** 7/2/2007  
**Re:** 10/608,862      **No. of pages including cover:** 5  
☒ **Urgent**      ☐ **For Review**      ☒ **Please Comment**      ☐ **Please Reply**

Examiner Koharski,


Per your instructions in our telephone interview of 6/22/07, the following are proposed claims to be filed next Monday with a Request for Continued Examination. I also attach a copy of the continuation sheet of your Interview Summary suggesting claim language. We look forward to your feedback with regard to the proposed claims.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if anything further is required.



Deanna J. Shirley, Reg. No. 39,026

I hereby certify under 37 CFR 1.8 that this Amendment and all supporting papers is being transmitted by facsimile (571) 273-8300 or by U.S. Mail First Class with sufficient postage to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria Virginia, 22313-1450 on the date specified below.



Deanna J. Shirley

Date

7-2-07

Jul 02 07 07:43p

Deanna Shirley

RECEIVED 571-8700

p. 1

08/23/07 SAT 07:15 FAX 7033059835

US PATENT OFFICE

CENTRAL FAX CENTER

003

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-413)

JUL 2 - 2007

Application No. 10/608,862

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant and Applicant's attorney kindly discussed the general nature of their invention of a "Computer-Assisted Manipulation of catheter and Guide Wires". Further the Examiner and Applicant's attorney positively discussed how the Ein-Gal reference was used as a rejection against the claims. Examiner stated that the claims and limitations thereof were read in the broadest reasonable interpretation, and the Ein-Gal prior art anticipated the claims as currently written. Specifically the limitation of the second motor coupled to a base enabling rotation about the axis on the elongate member was disclosed in the Ein-Gal reference (Figure 1B). Applicant's attorney and Examiner discussed possible amendments and other relevant prior art that was located in a search directed to the rotation mechanism, such as patent #s: 5,540,656; 6,485,482 and 5,269,751. Examiner suggested adding additional claim language drawn to medical use of the device and further definition of structural components of the rotation system (51, 53, 55) depicted in Figure 2. Examiner also requested formal drawings to be submitted.